

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/822,686	04/13/2004	Hyo-suk Kim	1572.1262	1572.1262 2992	
21171 የፒልልዩ & ሁል	7590 01/18/2008		EXAMINER		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700			LOPEZ, FRANK D		
1201 NEW YO WASHINGTO	ORK AVENUE, N.W. ON. DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
***************************************	11, 20 2000		3745		
				<u></u>	
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/18/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/822,686	KIM, HYO-SUK
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit
	F. Daniel Lopez	3745
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		
1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or		
this application, applicant must timely file one of the followal places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliantime periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, af otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	fidavit, or other evidence, which compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	•	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) a
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be 	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	ected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)): <u>112, 2nd paragraph; 102</u> .	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendment canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ wivided below or appended.	II be entered and an explanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>4-6,8 and 10</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		Constant
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N and sufficient reasons why the affidar	otice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered vit or other evidence is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails to provide a See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	

/F. Daniel Lopez/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3745

13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Appellant describes figure A, where the coil origin is located at the center of the upper core when the piston is at the top origin. The specification states that figure 9A has 2 curves (E, F) showing the movement of the piston. The second curve F is "where the core origin does not match the coil origin" (paragraph 44) which indicates that the coil origin is at the center of the piston movement. There is no indication in the disclosure that applicant intends the coil origin to be at the center of the upper core when the piston is at the top origin. Since the explanation odes not match the disclosure, it cannot explain how the system works.

If an important aspect of this invention is that the coil origin is close to the upper core origin when the piston is at or near top dead center (as described by Appellant in the explanation); then the disclosure is insufficient in describing necessary aspects of the invention, which would result in a 112 1st paragraph rejection of the specification.